

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

CONFIRMATION NO. ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE 205822US0CONT 8695 Hiroyoshi Tsuchiya 05/04/2001 09/848,439 **EXAMINER** 03/31/2004 22850 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. MORRIS, TERELL H 1940 DUKE STREET PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314 1771

DATE MAILED: 03/31/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Advisory Action | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----|
| | 09/848,439 | TSUCHIYA ET AL. | (Y) |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Terrel Morris | 1771 | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 10 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | | | |
| PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)] | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection. | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: | | | |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | | | |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | |
| (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 21 and 33. | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | | |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | | | |
| 7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: None. | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: <u>21 and 33</u> . | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-22,32 and 34-51</u> . | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 24-31. | | | |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner. | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | | | |
| 10. See Continuation Sheet | | | |

Continuation of 5: While applicant's comments are well taken, the features applicant relies on are not seen to be adequately expressed with the current claim language. Further, these features appear inseparably linked to the method of formation of the absorbent particles. The prior art is not seen to provide an equivalent process for producing such particles. As such, the rejections against claims 21 and 33 are hereby withdrawn. Regarding the remainder of the article claims, there is insufficient evidence of record to indicate the claimed particles are not equivalently disclosed in the prior art. Note MPEP 2112.

Continuation of 10. Other: If applicant puts the claims in condition for allowance and amends the withdrawn claims to be commensurate with the article claims while maintaining proper dependency, the examiner will rejoin at the time of allowance and issue all claims together. Lastly, it is not seen that the objection to the specification has been properly addressed by applicant.

TERREL MORRIS

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700